



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,437	11/21/2001	Mamiko Sugimoto	DP-820 US	1606
21254 7590 09/19/2008 MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817				
EXAMINER				
HOLTON, STEVEN E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/19/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

09/989,437

**Applicant(s)**

SUGIMOTO ET AL.

**Examiner**

Steven E. Holton

**Art Unit**

2629

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- 7) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is made in response to applicant's Request for Continued Examination filed on 6/24/2008. Claims 1-39 are currently pending in the application. An action follows below:

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner agrees that the specification does teach the idea of using character recognition on the input stroke data for determining that a letter such as 'A' has been input by the user. However, the use of character recognition on the input stroke information is performed to determine user input that is not the data identifier input by the user. The Applicant's specification, page 23, line 23 - page 24, line 3, clearly states that the data identifier is previously assigned to a segment and the inputted stroke information is only used to search information stored associated with a previously known data identifier. The stroke information input by the user does not contain the data identifier, and there is no specific teaching that the character recognition is used to determine if a data identifier has been received during this input process.

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's arguments (made 5/16/2008) that the Weber reference fails to teach "determining whether an identifier has been received in said input stroke information". The Applicant's arguments state that the claimed

invention requires determination and recognition of words made as part of the input. The claimed invention does not require a step of text recognition of the input information to determine if an identifier (which comprises a data identifier) has been input. The claimed invention only requires a determination that an identifier has been received in the stroke information. Also, the broad description within the Applicant's specification (page 18, line 17- page 19, line 2) does not mention a requirement of recognition of words formed by the input data strokes to determine the data identifier.

The Weber reference requires that input stroke information from the user is analyzed and it is then determined that an identifier has been received within the stroke information (defining an identifier requires that the user input it onto the system, and then indicate it using a circle command; col. 12, lines 54-66). Weber does not require a recognition step of the meaning of the inputted stroke information, but does determine that such an identifier has been input as part of the stroke information so that the identifier is determined and used to store data associated with the data identifier. The claimed invention merely requires determining a data identifier has been received in input stroke information. The Weber reference analyzes input stroke information to determine that an identifier has been received and then stores other data information in relation to the received data identifier. Thus, the Examiner interprets the method of Weber to perform the claimed steps of determining a data identifier in stroke information from a user input.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 16, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (USPN: 5572651), hereinafter Weber in view of Montlick (USPN: 5561446).

Regarding claim 1, Weber discloses an input device including an input device and display device (Fig. 1, elements 22, 26, and 30), and a storage element (Fig. 1, element 32). The input device of Weber operates including "the input/display device receiving input stroke information by handwriting (col. 10, lines 25-30); determining whether an identifier (Fig. 4, elements 84, 88, and 92; called a 'key identifier') has been received in said input stroke information (Fig. 3, element 50; col. 12, line 54 - col. 13, line 2)". Weber also discusses storing data in the memory based on an intra-identifier code (called a key object identifier) and the intra-identifier code is directly associated with the identifier (col. 13, lines 3-10; Figs. 3-5 are part of the description of this topic).

Weber does not expressly disclose storing medical data, however; the handwritten data stored by Weber as stroke information could be associated with medical information or any other type of information. Weber also does not disclose, "the input means moving in a sliding manner on a sheet label displayed at a particular position on a screen by the display means; and the input/display device reading, when

the input means moves onto said sheet label, data stored in said storage in relation to said sheet label from said storage, and displaying the data by conducting a change-over operation for said sheet label".

Montlick discloses a pen based input data entry system for storing substantially all medical data (col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 2). Montlick further discloses sheet labels (Fig. 2, element 32; each tab can be considered a sheet label associated with a specific page/sheet of information) where as the input means moves onto different sheet labels the information associated with said sheet label is displayed on the screen (col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 3). The Examiner notes that Montlick recites that touching the pen to any of the menu fields will select the menu field. Sliding the pen along the screen so that it touches one or another menu field would also select the menu field and display the information associated with the menu field. Montlick changing the display so that proper information is displayed constitutes a change-over operation.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Weber and Montlick. The handwriting input system of Weber could be combined with a medical specific input system for data input and forms as described by Montlick to provide predetermined forms and images specific to medical applications rather than note-taking or other handwriting activities. This would provide benefits of flexible categorical retrieval tool in a handwriting based input system (Weber, col. 4, lines 15-20) with a system for relating handwriting to other information without interpretation of the handwriting in a medical field (Montlick, col. 2, lines 37-40 and col. 3, line 60 - col. 4, line 21). Thus, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of

Weber and Montlick to combine the handwriting information tools of each in a medical context as described by Montlick to produce a device as described in claim 1.

Regarding claim 9, the Examiner notes that the claim states, "wherein the method comprises one of" and then provides a list of operations that are part of the method. The first operation described is the same as the operation described in claim 1. Therefore, the arguments applied to claim 1 can be applied to claim 9.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Montlick teaches, a medical treatment system where when the segments (Fig. 3, segments labeled 'Vital Signs', 'Eyes', 'Ears' and 'Other') of an input field are displayed (Fig. 3, element, element 50), the segments have labels assigned in a previously specified sequence. The Examiner notes that many of the input fields are pre-made forms from the central controller, thus the segment labels are assigned based on predetermined sequences.

Regarding claim 3, Montlick discloses, "wherein in the storage the data are substantially all stored after... an operation to explicitly close a medical report (col. 8, lines 1-9)."

Regarding claim 7, Montlick teaches, a medical treatment system where when the segments (Fig. 3, segments labeled 'Vital Signs', 'Eyes', 'Ears' and 'Other') of an input field are displayed (Fig. 3, element, element 50), the segments have labels assigned in a previously specified sequence. The Examiner notes that many of the input fields are pre-made forms from the central controller, thus the segment labels are assigned based on predetermined sequences.

Regarding claims 16 and 24, both Weber and Montlick utilize a pen-tablet type of input device (Weber, col. 11, lines 19-35; Montlick Fig. 1, element 12).

4. Claims 4-6, 8, and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Gourdol (USPN: 5583946).

Regarding claims 4-6, 8, and 11, as discussed above, the combination of Weber and Montlick disclose all of the limitations except "wherein said input-display device conducts character recognition processing for hand-written data inputted from said input means and comprising an array of values of coordinates, converts by said character recognition processing the data into text data including an array of character codes, and displays the text.

Gourdol discloses a handwriting based entry system that converts handwritten input into text to be displayed. Gourdol discloses handwriting data is stored as individual strokes, the strokes are further stored as an array of points defining each stroke ('smoothed stroke point array Q'; col. 8, line 46; methods of manipulating the stroke coordinates stored within the array are discussed regarding Fig. 5). Gourdol identifies the handwriting data as input as stroke information and then converts the handwriting data into character data for output as text on the display device (Fig. 2a; col. 5, lines 53-67).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick and Gourdol to produce a handwriting input system for medical record



storage and manipulation. The handwriting input system of Weber using strokes to store electronic ink inputs could be modified using the character recognition method described by Gourdol to provide reliable recognition of user inputted gestures (Gourdol, col. 3, lines 32-38). This modified handwriting input system could be combined with the tablet based medical records system of Montlick to provide a handwritten input system for medical record keeping with character recognition and text output as described in claims 4-6, 8, and 11.

5. Claims 12, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Mori (USPN: 608084).

Regarding claims 12, 13, and 15, as discussed above, the combination of Weber and Montlick disclose all of the limitations except, "wherein in the operation to read data from said storage and to display the data, when an unchangeable state is beforehand set to the data, said input-display device displays an item indicating that the data cannot be changed."

Mori teaches a method of accessing previously stored information files and when a file has been set to an unchangeable state, providing a visual item indicating the data cannot be displayed (Fig. 4b, element 417). Mori also discloses other methods of indicating read-only documents in the prior art section (col. 1, line 54 - col. 2, line 3).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick and Mori. The computer system having

saved medical records and other handwritten notes produced from the combination of Weber and Montlick could be further modified using the read-only indication methods described by Mori. The motivation would be to provide a visual indicator of the state of a data set or record when being viewed by a user (Mori, col. 2, lines 48-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick and Mori to produce a device as described in claims 12, 13, and 15.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber, Montlick, and Gourdol as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Mori.

As discussed above, the combination of Weber, Montlick, and Gourdol disclose all of the limitations except, "wherein in the operation to read data from said storage and to display the data, when an unchangeable state is beforehand set to the data, said input-display device displays an item indicating that the data cannot be changed."

Mori teaches a method of accessing previously stored information files and when a file has been set to an unchangeable state, providing a visual item indicating the data cannot be displayed (Fig. 4b, element 417). Mori also discloses other methods of indicating read-only documents in the prior art section (col. 1, line 54 - col. 2, line 3).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick, Gourdol, and Mori. The computer system having saved medical records and other handwritten notes produced from the combination of Weber, Montlick, and Gourdol could be further modified using the read-only indication methods described by Mori. The motivation would be to provide a visual

indicator of the state of a data set or record when being viewed by a user (Mori, col. 2, lines 48-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick, Gourdol, and Mori to produce a device as described in claims 12, 13, and 15.

7. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick and in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (disclosure page 22, line 28 - page 23, line 2), hereinafter AAPA.

Regarding claim 17, as discussed above, the combination of Weber and Montlick disclose all of the limitations except, "the input means dragging a particular input field selected from a plurality of input fields displayed at particular positions on a screen by said display means and dropping the particular input field onto said sheet label; and said storage storing data of said particular input field with a relationship established to said sheet label."

The AAPA discussed on pages 22 and 23 of the specification describe the method of dragging a segment and dropping into a sheet label and storing the information. Further, this technique is described as being analogous to the "drag and drop for Windows" and "the present invention may be an another OS having a same function about 'drag and drop'". The drag and drop technique described as part of claim 28 is therefore a previously known technology provided by other computer operating systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the pen input system of Weber and Montlick could be modified using the 'drag and drop'

technique of prior knowledge to produce the device as specified in claim 28. Weber discusses that pen movement within the describe system is similar to a mouse including click and drag equivalents (col. 19, lines 5-15). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to allow previously known graphical interface methods such as drag and drop to provide further functionality and interface for the user. Thus, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that a drag and drop technique as used in other common computer systems could be used with an input system as utilized by Weber and Montlick and the combination would produce a device as specified in claim 17.

Regarding claim 19, the claim discloses a method of dragging and dropping similar to claim 17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the dragging and dropping operation of the AAPA could be applied to the input fields or other segments displayed on the display screen.

8. Claims 18, 22, 23, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and in further view of Igarashi et al. (Applicant's Cited Prior Art: "An Architecture for Pen-based Interaction on Electronic Whiteboards"), hereinafter Igarashi.

Regarding claim 18, as discussed above the combination of Weber and Montlick discloses all of the limitations except, "the input means moving in a horizontal direction in a sliding manner to cross an input field displayed at a position on a screen by the display means; and the input/display device displaying the input field, the input field being subdivided into segments."

Igarashi discloses a method of splitting segments on a pen based input system by providing a vertical line across an input field (Fig. 2; section 3.1; Inking and Segmenting).

The Examiner notes that Igarashi only shows splitting a segment using a vertical line between two elements within the segment; however, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that splitting segments using a vertical line could be adapted to operate with a horizontal line and provide the same splitting functionality.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the pen and tablet based input system disclosed by Weber and Montlick with the segment splitting functionality of the system described by Igarashi. The stroke based input system of Weber could utilize the other types of stroke based input gestures described by Igarashi to extend the functionality of the pen based input system. The motivation for doing so would be to provide users with flexibility for organizing and working with written input placed on the input system (Igarashi, paragraph spanning the end of the first page to the beginning of the second page). Thus, it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Weber and Montlick with the teachings of Igarashi to produce a method as described in claim 18.

Regarding claims 22 and 23, Igarashi discloses "dragging an input field selected from a plurality of input fields displayed at positions on a screen by the display means and moving the input field in the screen; and the input/display device one of minimizing or magnifying one of the input field and other input fields on the screen according to movement of the input field dragged by the input means (Igarashi, Fig. 3; section 3.1

final paragraph). This type of moving and squashing would be used to ensure visibility and to keep segments from overlapping when being moved around the screen by the user (Igarashi; section 3.1; final paragraph). This allows hand-written notes and input to be kept visible and selectable for the user.

Regarding claim 30, the Examiner notes that like claim 9, claim 30 recites the method "further comprising one of" and then lists various actions. The seventh and eighth operations are the same as the ones defined in claim 22 and 23 and therefore the arguments can be applied to claim 30 as well.

Regarding claim 27 (which is dependent on claim 30), Montlick teaches, "wherein said input/display device is a pen-tablet device (Fig. 1, element 12)."

9. Claim 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of Fenster et al. (USPN: 5454371), herein after Fenster.

Regarding claim 20, as discussed above Weber and Montlick discloses all of the limitations except, "the input means moving from a first point to a second point on an image displayed at a position on a screen by the display means; and the input/display device measuring a distance of movement between the first and the second points and displaying the distance over the image."

Fenster discloses a medical imaging system where images can be manipulated and measured using points defined by the user input device (col. 23, lines 25-39). The Examiner notes that the Fenster does not specify where the measured distance is

displayed on the screen, but the Examiner states that it would be a design choice for one skilled in the art to display the measured value above the image or inside the image or at any desired location on the screen. Further, Fenster discloses the system using a mouse but states that the system could be realized using various input devices including digitizer and light pen (col. 23, lines 62-67).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Weber and Montlick with the teachings of Fenster. The motivation for doing so would have been to the user with techniques for manipulating images displayed on display screen (Fenster, col. 1, lines 47-52). Thus, it would have been obvious to provide methods of manipulating images by allowing a user to measure distances on within the image and displaying such distances as disclosed by Fenster with the medical input system disclosed by Weber and Montlick to produce the device in claim 20.

Regarding claim 21, Fenster discloses method of drawing a trace beginning at a point displayed at a position on the screen and then rotating the image based on the length and direction of the trace (Figs. 21a –21c; col. 17, lines 10-56).

10. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of Tanaka (USPN: 5249296).

Regarding 25, as discussed above Weber and Montlick discloses all of the limitations except, “the input means dragging a sheet label displayed at positions on a

screen by the display means and moving the sheet label upward; and the input/display device reading data stored in the storage in relation to the sheet label from the storage and displaying the data below the sheet label by classifying the data.”

Tanaka discloses a gesture based input system for a pen based input system. The input system allows that a new window is opened after the execution of a dragging operation of an icon on the screen (abstract; col. 3, lines 9-12; col. 5, lines 9-28). The Examiner states that the dragging operation of Tanaka involves selecting an associated icon for a record/file/program and then dragging the icon to a location on the screen, wherein the computer system then opens a window and displays the associated information to the icon. The dragging operation may be done in any direction including up; and the generic icon of Tanaka also covers a sheet label or other type of designation of a file or program operating on the computer system.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that would be possible to modify a handwriting input system such as disclosed by Weber and Montlick with the ability to select an icon and drag the icon in a direction to display the file information at the location specified by the drag operation as disclosed by Tanaka. The motivation for doing so would have been “to provide an information processing apparatus for controlling window positions, the apparatus allowing the user to employ any one of the two icon-selecting methods, “check” and “drag” (Tanaka, col. 2, lines 34-38)” also Tanaka finds prior art systems for displaying a window to be “complicated, constrained and confusing (col. 2, line 30).” Thus, it would have been



obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Weber, Montlick and Tanaka to produce a device as specified in claim 25.

11. Claims 26, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick and in view of Gourdol and in view of AAPA.

Regarding claim 28, Weber discloses an input device including an input device and display device (Fig. 1, elements 22, 26, and 30), and a storage element (Fig. 1, element 32). The input device of Weber operates including "the input/display device receiving a first input stroke information by handwriting (col. 10, lines 25-30); determining whether an identifier (Fig. 4, elements 84, 88, and 92; called a 'key identifier') has been received in said input stroke information (Fig. 3, element 50; col. 12, line 54 - col. 13, line 2)". Weber also discusses storing data in the memory based on an intra-identifier code (called a key object identifier) and the intra-identifier code is directly associated with the identifier (col. 13, lines 3-10; Figs. 3-5 are part of the description of this topic). Weber discloses processing received input stroke information to determine a specific gesture has been made by handwritten input by the user (Fig. 12 and 13).

Weber does not expressly disclose storing medical data, however; the handwritten data stored by Weber as stroke information could be associated with medical information or any other type of information. Weber does not disclose performing character recognition processing of a receiving a second input stroke

information to determine, Weber only discloses gesture recognition of analyzing the stroke information. Weber also does not disclose, "the input means drags a particular input field selected from a plurality of input fields displayed at particular positions on a screen by said display means and drops the particular input field onto a sheet label, and said storage stores data of said particular input field with a relationship established to said sheet label."

Montlick discloses a pen based input data entry system for storing substantially all medical data (col. 4, line 66 - col. 5, line 2).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Weber and Montlick. The handwriting input system of Weber could be combined with a medical specific input system for data input and forms as described by Montlick to provide predetermined forms and images specific to medical applications rather than note-taking or other handwriting activities. This would provide benefits of flexible categorical retrieval tool in a handwriting based input system (Weber, col. 4, lines 15-20) with a system for relating handwriting to other information without interpretation of the handwriting in a medical field (Montlick, col. 2, lines 37-40 and col. 3, line 60 - col. 4, line 21). Thus, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Weber and Montlick to combine the handwriting information tools of each in a medical context as described by Montlick to produce a device as described in claim 28.

Neither Weber nor Montlick disclose performing character recognition on the stroke information input by the user. And they fail to disclose, "the input means drags a particular input field selected from a plurality of input fields displayed at particular

positions on a screen by said display means and drops the particular input field onto a sheet label, and said storage stores data of said particular input field with a relationship established to said sheet label.”

Gourdol discloses a handwriting based entry system that converts handwritten input into text to be displayed. Gourdol discloses handwriting data is stored as individual strokes, the strokes are further stored as an array of points defining each stroke ('smoothed stroke point array Q'; col. 8, line 46; methods of manipulating the stroke coordinates stored within the array are discussed regarding Fig. 5). Gourdol identifies the handwriting data as input as stroke information and then converts the handwriting data into character data for output as text on the display device (Fig. 2a; col. 5, lines 53-67).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick and Gourdol to produce a handwriting input system for medical record storage and manipulation. The handwriting input system of Weber using strokes to store electronic ink inputs could be modified using the character recognition method described by Gourdol to provide reliable recognition of user inputted gestures (Gourdol, col. 3, lines 32-38). This modified handwriting input system could be combined with the tablet based medical records system of Montlick to provide a handwritten input system for medical record keeping with character recognition and text output.

However, the combination of Weber, Montlick, and Gourdol fail to disclose, “the input means drags a particular input field selected from a plurality of input fields displayed at particular positions on a screen by said display means and drops the

particular input field onto a sheet label, and said storage stores data of said particular input field with a relationship established to said sheet label."

The AAPA discussed on pages 22 and 23 of the specification describe the method of dragging a segment and dropping into a sheet label and storing the information. Further, this technique is described as being analogous to the "drag and drop for Windows" and "the present invention may be an another OS having a same function about 'drag and drop'". The drag and drop technique described as part of claim 28 is therefore a previously known technology provided by other computer operating systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the pen input system of Weber, Montlick, and Gourdol could be modified using the 'drag and drop' technique of prior knowledge to produce the device as specified in claim 28. Weber discusses that pen movement within the describe system is similar to a mouse including click and drag equivalents (col. 19, lines 5-15). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to allow previously known graphical interface methods such as drag and drop to provide further functionality and interface for the user. Thus, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that a drag and drop technique as used in other common computer systems could be used with an input system as utilized by Weber, Montlick, and Gourdol and the combination would produce a device as specified in claim 28.

Regarding claim 26, Montlick teaches, "wherein said input/display device is a pen-tablet device (Fig. 1, element 12)."

Regarding claim 29, Montlick teaches, "wherein in the storage the data are substantially all stored after... an operation to explicitly close a medical report (col. 8, lines 1-9)."

12. Claims 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Frasca Jr. (USPN: 6055506).

Regarding claims 31 and 33, as discussed above the combination of Weber and Montlick disclose all of the limitations except, "wherein said identifier comprises an input device identifier that identifies an identity of an input operator."

Frasca Jr. discloses providing identifier codes that identify the input operator of a data record (Fig. 9, element 236; col. 9, lines 44-53).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick and Frasca Jr. The input system of Weber could be modified so that the identity of the input operator could be provided based on the input device used as disclosed by Frasca Jr. The rationale for doing so would be to provide further information and identification for storage of records within a central storage system. The information would allow review of who entered records, made diagnoses, or searchable records based on who made an entry within the system to determine treatment history by different users. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick and Frasca Jr. to provide an input method for medical treatment as disclosed in claims 31 and 33.

Regarding claims 32 and 34, discloses providing identifier codes that identify the location that data was input from (Fig. 9, element 208; col. 9, lines 9-22). The Examiner notes that the Site could be modified to include the device the actual physical device used to enter the data element rather than a physical outpatient location used to enter the data from.

13. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick in view of AAPA as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Frasca Jr.

Regarding claim 35, as discussed above the combination of Weber, Montlick, and AAPA disclose all of the limitations except, "wherein said identifier comprises an input device identifier that identifies an identity of an input operator."

Frasca Jr. discloses providing identifier codes that identify the input operator of a data record (Fig. 9, element 236; col. 9, lines 44-53).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that to combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick, AAPA and Frasca Jr. The input system of Weber could be modified so that the identity of the input operator could be provided based on the input device used as disclosed by Frasca Jr. The rationale for doing so would be to provide further information and identification for storage of records within a central storage system. The information would allow review of who entered records, made diagnoses, or searchable records based on who made an entry within the system to determine treatment history by different users. Thus, it would have been obvious to

combine the teachings of Weber, Montlick, AAPA and Frasca Jr. to provide an input method for medical treatment as disclosed in claims 35.

Regarding claims 36, discloses providing identifier codes that identify the location that data was input from (Fig. 9, element 208; col. 9, lines 9-22). The Examiner notes that the Site could be modified to include the device the actual physical device used to enter the data element rather than a physical outpatient location used to enter the data from.

14. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick in view of Gourdol as applied to claim 4 and further in view of Mori, Igarashi, Frasca Jr. and Tanaka.

Regarding claim 37, the Examiner notes that the claim is composed of limitations from previously presented claims, such as 2, 12, 17, 25, 29, 30, 31, and 32. Each of these elements are disclosed in references as discussed above. The combination of all of these references would therefore read on the limitations of claim 37.

15. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber in view of Montlick in view of Gourdol as applied to claim 11 and in further view of Mori, and Frasca Jr..

Regarding claim 38, the Examiner notes that the claim is composed of limitations from previously presented claims, such as 10, 12, 33 and 34. Each of these limitations

are disclosed in references as discussed above. The combination of these references would therefore read on the limitations of claim 38.

16. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber, Montlick, Gourdol, Mori, and Frasca Jr. as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Igarashi.

Regarding claim 39, the Examiner notes that the limitations of this claim are the same as those of claim 30. Thus, the combination of the references regarding claim 38 along with the Igarashi reference would produce a method as described in claim 39.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven E. Holton whose telephone number is (571)272-7903. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Steven E. Holton  
Division 2629  
September 14, 2008  
/Bipin Shalwala/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629